1		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		r No. 186670  . 258941 m)  407-5391  PY  CERR U.S. DISTRICT AND PH  FILED
8		
10	ZENIA CHAVARRIA, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,	Cap Vol 1 - 0 2 1 0 9 RSWL (VBK) CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
11	Plaintiff,	(1) Violation of California Labor Code && 510 and 1198 (Unnaid Overtime):
12	vs.	<ol> <li>(1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);</li> <li>(2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal</li> </ol>
13	RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY,	(3) Violation of California Labor Code
14	RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY, an Ohio Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	§ 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
15	Defendants.	(4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 (Unpaid
16		Minimum Wages); (5) Violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and
17		202 (Wages Not Timely Paid Upon Termination);
18		(6) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment):
19		During Employment); (7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-compliant Wage
20		Statements); (8) Violation of California Business &
21		Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.  Jury Trial Demanded
22		J J A
23		
25		
26		
27		
28		
_		

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Zenia Chavarria, individually and on behalf of all other members of the public similarly situated, alleges as follows:

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This class action is brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure section 23 for various violations of the California Labor Code and California law.
- 2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY (Defendant), was incorporated in the State of Ohio and maintains its principal place of business in Ohio and is thus a citizen of Ohio. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of California. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the total amount in controversy related to her claims are in excess of \$75,000. Thus, this Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Moreover, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that the aggregate amount in controversy for this class action exceeds five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs, and that the class exceeds 100 members. Plaintiff alleges that the vast majority of putative class members, including Plaintiff, are citizens of California. Thus this Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) and (b) because Defendant maintains offices, has agents, and is licensed to transact and does transact business, in this district.

#### THE PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff ZENIA CHAVARRIA is a resident of Los Angeles County, California.
- 5. Defendant RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY, was and is, upon information and belief, an Ohio corporation and an employer whose employees

are engaged throughout this county, the State of California and the various states of the United States of America.

- 6. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 10, but pray for leave to amend and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 10 are the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers or employees of RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein was performed by, or is attributable to, RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY and DOES 1 through 10 (collectively 'Defendants'), each acting as the agent for the other, with legal authority to act on the other's behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official policy of Defendants.
- 9. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences and transactions alleged herein.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 11. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(2), and/or (b)(3).
  - 12. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

13. The proposed subclasses consist of and are defined as:

#### Unpaid Wages Subclass:

All non-exempt or hourly paid employees who worked as "Service Deli Clerks' for Defendants in California within four years prior to the filing of this complaint until the date of certification.

#### Penalties Subclass:

All former non-exempt or hourly paid employees of Defendants who worked as "Service Deli Clerks" in California within one year prior to the filing of this complaint until the date of certification and did not receive an accurate wage statement.

- 14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish sub-classes as appropriate.
- There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the 15. class is readily ascertainable:
  - Numerosity: The members of the class (and each subclass, if (a) any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, however, the class is estimated to be greater than one-hundred (100) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.
  - Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and (b) adequately protect the interests of each class member with whom they have a well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all class members' as demonstrated herein.
  - (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and

adequately, protect the interests of each class member with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as alleged herein. Plaintiff acknowledges that she has an obligation to make known to the Court any relationship, conflicts, or differences with any class member. Plaintiffs attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

- (d) <u>Superiority</u>: The nature of this action makes the use of class action adjudication superior to other methods. Class action will achieve economies of time, effort and expense as compared with separate lawsuits, and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be adjudicated in the same manner and at the same time for the entire class.
- (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers of the State violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 16. At all relevant times set forth, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as non-exempt or hourly employees.
- 17. Defendants employed Plaintiff from October 2008 to March 2009 as a "Service Deli Clerk" at Defendants' store location in Los Angeles, California. While employed as a "Service Deli Clerk," Plaintiff's general job duties were to prepare and roast rotisserie chicken, perform temperature checks to monitor the rotisserie chicken, prepare sandwiches, maintain food safety standards, and maintain and clean the Service Deli area.
- 18. Defendants continue to employ other non-exempt or hourly employees within California and throughout the United States.
- 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that employees were not paid for all hours worked, because all hours worked were not recorded.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees and advisors knowledgeable about California labor and wage law, employment and personnel practices, and about the requirements of California law.
- 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that
  Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were
  entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not
  receiving certain wages for overtime compensation, in violation of the California
  Labor Code.
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that

  Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were
  entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at

Plaintiffs and class members' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely uninterrupted meal period. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff was not provided timely and uninterrupted meal periods.

- 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that
  Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were
  entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at
  Plaintiff's and class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed. In
  violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff was not provided rest periods.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for work that was required to be done off-the-clock. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff was not paid at least minimum wages for work done off-the-clock.
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive all the wages owed to them upon discharge. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff did not receive all wages owed to her, including, but not limited to, overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, upon her discharge from Defendants' employ.
- 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to timely payment of wages during employment. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff did not receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, within permissible time periods.
  - 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff was not provided complete and accurate wage statements.

- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and class members, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but wilfully, knowingly and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff and other class members that they were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.
- California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of 29. the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due [to] him [or her] under this article."

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 – Unpaid Overtime (Against All Defendants)

- 30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 29.
- California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial 31. Welfare Commission (TWC') Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.
- Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that 32. Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty

- (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 33. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week.
- 34. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day and in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.
- 35. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members worked off-the-clock. For example, Plaintiff was required to work through her meal and rest periods after clocking out due to insufficient staffing, causing her shifts to exceed eight (8) hours. Plaintiff was not paid overtime for this off-the-clock work.
- 36. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.
- 37. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

### Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) – Unpaid Meal Period Premiums

#### (Against All Defendants)

- 38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 37.
- 39. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and class

members' employment by Defendants.

- 40. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.
- 41. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.
- 42. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.
- 43. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and class members for work performed during meal periods. For example, Plaintiff was required to remain within the Service Deli department during her meal period in order to assist customers. Defendants often did not schedule sufficient employees so as to allow Plaintiff to take a full 30-minute and uninterrupted meal period.
- 44. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.
- 45. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

46. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the meal period was not provided.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 – Unpaid Rest Period Premiums (Against All Defendants)

- 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 46.
- 48. At all relevant times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiffs and class members' employment by Defendants.
- 49. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.
- 50. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that '[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period' and that the 'rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.
- 51. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked. For example, Plaintiff frequently was unable to take a rest break because of insufficient staffing.
- 52. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and class members to work during rest periods.

- 53. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.
- 54. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.
- 55. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 – Unpaid Minimum Wages

#### (Against All Defendants)

- 56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 55.
- 57. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
- 58. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members were frequently required to work during meal and rest periods without compensation. For example, Plaintiff and class members had to remain within the Service Deli department after clocking out for lunch to assist customers.
- 59. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1. Plaintiff was not paid for the time she worked through meal and rest periods.

- 60. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class Members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.
- 61. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.
- 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 – Wages Not Timely Paid Upon Termination (Against All Defendants)

- 63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 62.
- 64. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

- 65. During the relevant time period, Defendants wilfully failed to pay class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their earned and unpaid wages, including but not limited to unpaid overtime, minimum wages and/or meal and rest period premiums, either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.
- 66. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.
- 67. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.
- 68. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

#### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## Violation of California Labor Code § 204 – Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment

#### (Against All Defendants)

- 69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 68.
- 70. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon

termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

- 71. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.
- 72. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.
- 73. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and class members all wages due to them, including but not limited to, unpaid overtime, minimum wages and/or meal and rest period premiums, within any time period permissible by California Labor Code section 204.
- 74. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover all remedies available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.
- 75. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 210 provides that every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee in violation of California Labor Code section 204 shall be subjected to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each subsequent violation, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount withheld.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) – Non-compliant Wage Statements

#### (Against All Defendants)

76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated

herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 75.

- 77. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine items of information, including total hours worked by the employee, all applicable hourly rates and the total hours worked at each rate by the employee, the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid and the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.
- 78. Defendants have intentionally and wilfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to list the total hours worked.
- 79. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.
- 80. Specifically, Plaintiff and class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code section 226(a).
- 81. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.
- 82. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g), Plaintiff and class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq. (Against All Defendants)

- 83. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 82.
- 84. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.
- 85. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq*.
- A violation of California Business & Professions Code sections 86. 17200 et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. Here, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of not paying at least minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1. Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages upon termination violate California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages violate California Labor Code section 204. Finally, Defendants' policies and practices of providing inaccurate wage statements violate California Labor Code section 226(a).

1

- 567
- 8 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 1415
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 2122
- 23
- 2425
- 2627
- 28

- 87. Plaintiff and class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money or property.
- 88. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200 et seq., Plaintiff and class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and class members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

#### **REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff requests trial by jury.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For damages, restitution and penalties in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).

#### **Class Certification**

- 2. That this class be certified as a class action;
- 3. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representatives of the Class; and
- 4. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

#### As to the First Cause of Action

- 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and class members;
- 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

- 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
- 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a); and
- 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

#### As to the Second Cause of Action

- 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and class members;
- 11. That the Court make an award to the Plaintiff and class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;
- 12. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
  - 13. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);
- 14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and
- 15. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

#### As to the Third Cause of Action

- 16. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and class members;
- 17. That the Court make an award to the Plaintiff and class members of one (l) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

workday that a rest period was not provided;

- For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, 18. according to proof;
  - For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b); **19**.
- 20. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and
- 21. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

#### As to the Fourth Cause of Action

- 22. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and class members;
- 23. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
- 24. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;
- For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date 25. such amounts were due;
- For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein 26. pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);
- For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 27. 1194.2; and
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable 28. and appropriate.

#### As to the Fifth Cause of Action

29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and other terminated class members:
- For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages. according to proof;
- 31. For waiting time penalties according to proof pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for all employees who have left Defendants' employ;
- For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such 32. amounts were due; and
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable 33. and appropriate.

#### As to the Sixth Cause of Action

- 34. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204, to Plaintiff and class members;
- 35. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code 36. section 210 for Plaintiff and all other class members;
- 37. For pre-judgment interest on any untimely paid compensation, from the date such amounts were due; and
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable 38. and appropriate.

#### As to the Seventh Cause of Action

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and

- 40. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 41. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);
- 42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g); and
- 43. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

#### As to the Eighth Cause of Action

- 44. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and class members, failing to pay for all missed meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and class members, by failing to pay Plaintiff's and class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203 and 204 and by failing to provide Plaintiff and class members with complete and accurate wage statements.
- 45. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all class members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;
- 46. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code sections 17200 et seq.;
  - 47. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein

pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; 1 For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant 48. 2 to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200 et seq; and 3 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable 49. 4 and appropriate. 5 6 Dated: March 11, 2011 LAW OFFICES OF MARK YABLONOVICH 7 8 9 By: 10 Mark Yablonovich, Michael Coats, Esq. 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff Zenia Chavarria, 12 and all others similarly situated 13 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 14 Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial as provided by Rule 38(a) of the 15 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 16 **17** Dated: March 11, 2011 18 LAW OFFICES OF MARK YABLONOVICH 19 20 By: 21 Mark Yablohovich, Esq. 22 Michael Coats, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff Zenia Chavarria, 23 and all others similarly situated 24 25 26 27

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Ronald S. W. Lew and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Victor B. Kenton.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV11- 2109 RSWL (VBKx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should	be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge	
==============		=

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X] Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
---	---	--

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

LAW OFFICES OF MARK YABLONOVICH

Mark Yablonovich, Esq. (SBN 186670) Michael Coats, Esq. (SBN 258941)

60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

1875 Century Park East, Suite 700				
Los Angeles, CA 90067				
Telephone: (310) 286-0246				
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC				
ZENIA CHAVARRIA, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,	CASE NUMBER			
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV11-02109 <sub>PSWL (VE</sub>			
RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY, an Ohio Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	SUMMONS			
DEFENDANT(S).				
A lawsuit has been filed against you.  Within 21 days after service of this summor must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached © counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Lay 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700, Los Angeles, CA 90 judgment by default will be entered against you for the ryour answer or motion with the court.	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer w Offices of Mark Yablonovich, whose address is 067.  If you fail to do so.			

CV-01A (12/07) SUMMONS

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed

# UNITED S'. Les DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC-OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself [1])  ZENIA CHAVARRIA, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated					DEFENDANTS RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY, an Ohio Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive							
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yourself, provide same.)					Attorneys	(If Known)						
LAW OFFICES OF MARK YABLONOVICH  Mark Yablonovich, Esq. (SBN 186670), Michael Coats, Esq. (SBN 258941)  1875 Century Park East, Suite 700, Los Angeles, CA 90067, (310) 286-0246												
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)  III. CITIZE (Place as				III. CITIZENSI (Place an X	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only a X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)							
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			PJI			PTF		F PTF DEF				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant				Citizen of Another State 2		<b>□</b> 2	<b>™</b> 2				<b>d</b> 5	
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or	e box o	nlv.)		Citizen or Subjec	t of a For	eign Country	□3	□3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
Original Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Appellate Court Reopened State Court Proceeding State Court Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened State Court Reopened												
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL CLASS ACTION under F.R.O.	AINT:	JURY DEMAND: MY	Yes 🛚									
			ch von	E M	ONEY D	EMANDED	IN C	OMPL.	AINT: § In excess	s of \$5,000,000	).00	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit CA Labor code sections 5	10, 1198	, 226.7, 512(a), 1194, 119	7, 1197	.1, 201, 202, 204,	a brief st 226(a); B	tatement of cau usiness and Pr	ise. I ofessi	Oo not c ions Co	ite jurisdictional st te section 17200	atutes unless div	ersity.)	
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	e an X	in one box only.)							17200.	<del></del>		
		A SERVICE							*			
☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust		Insurance Marine	□ 310	Airplane						☐ 710 Fair La		ndards
☐ 430 Banks and Banking	□ 130	Miller Act	□ 315	Airplane Product		Other Fraud	<u>.</u> . )	510	Motions to Vacate Sentence	Act		
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc	☐ 140	Negotiable Instrument		Liability	□ 371	Truth in Len	ding		Habeas Corpus	□ 720 Labor/I Relatio		
□ 460 Deportation	120	Recovery of	320	Assault, Libel & Slander	□ 380	Other Person	al .	□ 530	General	□ 730 Labor/I		
□ 470 Racketeer Influenced		Overpayment & Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employers'		Property Day	nage	□ 535	Death Penalty	Reporti	ng &	
and Corrupt	1	Judgment	1	Liability	10 385	Property Dar Product Liab	nage	□ 540		Disclos	ure Act	
Organizations	D 151	Medicare Act		Marine		Froduct Lian		LJ 550	Other Civil Rights	□ 740 Railway	y Labor	r Act
☐ 480 Consumer Credit	□ 152	Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Product		Appeal 28 U	SC	D 555	Prison Condition	790 Other L Litigati	abor	
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service	ĺ	Student Loan (Excl.	350	Liability Motor Vehicle	1	158	_		t sales Condition	□ 791 Empl. I	ou Let Inc	
☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	D 153	Veterans)		Motor Vehicle	□ 423	Withdrawal :	28			Security	y Act	•
Exchange	,	Overpayment of	L	Product Liability		USC 157			Agriculture			
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12		Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal Injury	□ <b>44</b> 1	Voting		□ 620	Other Food & Drug	□ 820 Copyrig	zhts	
USC 3410		Stockholders' Suits	□ 362	Personal Injury-		Employment		□ 625	Drug Related	□ 830 Patent □ 840 Tradem	ark	
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Act	190	Other Contract Contract Product		Med Malpractice	□ 443	Housing/Acc	×0-	-	Seizure of	2 040 Hadein		
□ 892 Economic Stabilization	133	Liability	□ 365	Personal Injury-	L.,,,	mmodations			Property 21 USC	□ 861 HIA (1:	395ff)	
Act	<b>196</b>	Franchise	□ 368	Product Liability Asbestos Personal		Welfare American wi	4.	□ 62A	881	□ 862 Black I	ung (92	23)
□ 893 Environmental Matters				Injury Product		Disabilities	4		Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck	□ 863 D[WC/		
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act		Land Condemnation		Liability	_	<b>Employment</b>			Airline Regs	(405(g) □ 864 SSID T	, itle XV	T
□ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-		Foreclosure Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462	Neturalization	■ □ 446	American wi	th		Occupational	□ 865 RSI (40	5(g))	-
nation Under Equal	240	Torts to Land	***	Application		Disabilities -		C	Safety /Health	and the second		A NO.
Access to Justice	<b>245</b>	Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Habeas Corpus-	<b>□ 44</b> 0	Other Other Civil		□ 690	Other	□ 870 Taxes (		aintiff
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	□ 290	All Other Real Property	□ <b>46</b> 5	Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions	1	Rights				or Defe □ 871 IRS-Th USC 76	ird Part	y 26
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: CV11-02109												
AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.												

# UNITED ST 15 DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: If yes, list case number(s):	Has this action been p	reviously filed in this court a	and dismissed, remanded or closed? MNo 🗆 Yes				
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: 1 If yes, list case number(s).	lave any cases been pr	eviously filed in this court th	nat are related to the present case? M No Yes				
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:  (Check all boxes that apply)    A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or  D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.							
IX. VENUE: (When completing  (a) List the County in this Distr  Check here if the government	ict; California County	outside of this District: State	if other than California and Paris Commission of California				
County in this District:*	it, its agencies or empl	oyees is a named plaintiff. If	t dits box is checked, go to item (b).				
Los Angeles County			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
200 ringules country							
	ct; California County out, its agencies or emplo	outside of this District; State oyees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
			Ohio				
(c) List the County in this Distri	ct; California County on cases, use the locati	outside of this District; State	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.				
County in this District:			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
All Counties in California bot	h in and outside this	District.	All Counties in California both in and outside this District.				
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Ber Note: In land condemnation cases	, use the location of the	entura, Santa Barbara, or a					
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNE			Date March 11, 2011				
but is used by the Clerk of th	e Court for the purpose	of statistics, venue and initia	rmation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings see of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)				
Key to Statistical codes relating to	Social Security Cases						
Nature of Suit Coo	le Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action				
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))					
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)					
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
864	SSID	All claims for supplements Act, as amended.	al security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (U.S.C. (g))	old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42				

CV-71 (05/08)